



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

cial power felt confident that there existed no possible means of evasion of the limitation; that the same simple rules applied to all, and there could be no secret force unless by absolute open breach of faith.

#### HOW THE INCREASED COST HAS BEEN BROUGHT ABOUT

The great increase of cost of modern navies has been primarily due to the fact that the modern science in metallurgy and electricity and mechanical invention in prime movers (motive plants, including steam-engines or turbines) has rendered possible and advantageous an enormous increase in size of battleships, whereas for tactical and strategic reasons the tendency is to maintain the same number of units as when the ships were smaller. The same reasons have increased the caliber and power of great guns as well as their accuracy and rapidity of fire, all tending to increase the cost of construction, maintenance, and use, as well as the number of officers and men for each unit. Since 1900 battleships have increased three to three and a half times in size and five to six times in cost.

Coincident with the increase of cost and power of the battleships has been an increase in the number and efficiency of its minor enemies, particularly the torpedo, the submarine, the airplane, and the mine. The increase of the minor enemies has increased the number, cost, and size of the adjuncts of the main battle fleet, namely, the battle cruiser, the destroyer, and the air fleet.

The increase has been geometrical and shows no sign of retardation. It exists not only in the fleet itself, but in the number of fleet auxiliaries, in the capacity and number of shore stations, and the much higher standard of personnel, both men and officers.

#### SUGGESTED LIMITATIONS THAT COULD NOT BE ENFORCED

Navies are currently compared by tonnages of ships available for active service, sometimes separating the tonnage of the first line or most modern from that of the second line, or reserve, sometimes comparing the tonnage of first lines when ships, building or authorized, are completed at a given future date.

These methods are very rough and highly empirical unless subjected to most careful analysis, and even then are doubtful, for all countries do not publish all the facts.

It is barely conceivable that it would be possible to arrive at a limitation of navies by tonnage. Such a method would be very difficult to agree upon and could not be enforced.

Similar difficulties would be encountered by limitations of cost or limitation of new units to be added to an existing fleet. Limitations based on enlisted men, coast line, population, wealth, exposed property, would lead to insoluble questions in the attempt to agree and would materially alter the prestige of the nations.

#### THE COMPLETE SOLUTION—ABANDON THE BATTLESHIP AND SUBMARINE

Therefore, it would appear if there is to be a real limitation equally applicable to all, simple of application, and not necessarily altering the reactive position of naval powers, it must be a radical one, real and not make-believe. If this be the purpose of the conference, the method is easy. Abandon the battleship!

Let it be agreed that all battleships, all fighting ships of any type over 15,000 tons displacement, all guns over 6-inch caliber, and all submarines be at once scrapped and for the future forbidden. The problem would be solved. There is no other complete solution.

Such a solution would be to the advantage of small States, but need not finally alter the relative power of large ones. If it were desired to further handicap the naval architect in the development of the types of vessels remaining at his disposal, it might be also provided that the use of any protective armor plating be forbidden.

#### WOULD REDUCE NAVAL EXPENDITURES 75 TO 90 PER CENT

The limitation of naval armaments by the abandonment of the battleship, big guns, and the submarine would prob-

ably result in decreasing naval expenditures by 75 to 90 per cent and would effect a considerable but not so great reduction in the cost of coast defense, which would become easily effective against the type of cruisers and destroyers of which navies would then consist. Such navies could still make blockades effective and would be efficient commerce destroyers, though merchant vessels, if armed, might put up a fair fight. Under such limitations it would not be necessary to raise the question of freedom of the seas, which, if it were declared, would be an aid to the warlike.

The limitation of land forces is a much simpler problem, and an effective example is contained in the provisions of the Versailles Treaty as to the German Army. It does not appear to have been noticed that the one advantage given by the treaty to Germany is the economic relief of the cost of an army and navy.

Land armies can be effectively limited by the number of men with the colors and in the trained reserves.

#### JAPAN'S "GRAND OLD WOMAN"



Mme. Kajo Yajima, ninety years old but still young, has brought to this country a peace petition 100 yards long and signed by more than 10,000 Japanese women who wish to end war. Mme. Yajima will shortly present this petition to President Harding, after which she will participate in the disarmament conference. She is Japan's first woman teacher and is famous in her land for her advanced ideas and as a leader of her sex.

Mme. Kaji Yajima has been called the Frances Willard of the Flowery Kingdom. She is certainly one of the most

interesting women of her race—indeed, of the world—just now. Our interest in her is due not alone to the fact that she is ninety years of age, but to the fact that she is a social welfare worker who has traveled many thousands of miles to present to President Harding a “prayer for peace” from 10,203 of Japanese women. The petition is headed by the resolution adopted by the Japanese women, as follows: “We, the undersigned, solemnly declare that we most earnestly desire that the coming conference which is to be held in Washington shall prove to be the means of promoting world peace.”

Our readers will be interested to know more of this remarkable little lady, hence we publish a short sketch of her life and work:

Born in Kumamoto, she remained in her native city until fifty years old, still thinking that the world was flat, never hearing of Christianity and interested in little outside of her immediate surroundings. At the death of her husband, who was an addict to drink, she had a vision of work ahead for her, and, going alone to Tokyo, she became acquainted with members of a Presbyterian missionary post, where she soon plunged into study, and, after a few years of training by them, founded the first temperance society in Japan. She served as its president for thirty-five years.

Mme. Yajima qualified as a teacher, was baptized into the Christian faith by Dr. Thompson, a Presbyterian missionary, and afterward became head of a large school for girls, with which she has been identified for more than forty years, being the first woman in Japan to receive a government certificate to teach.

For her patriotic and humanitarian service she was decorated by the emperor at the time of his coronation. On her first visit to the United States, in 1906, she was received by President Roosevelt at the White House, and conveyed to him the gratitude of her countrywomen for his kindly attitude toward Japan in her time of need.

This remarkable woman, who hardly looks a day over sixty, is making the long journey at her own expense, using the money given her on her eighty-eighth birthday by former pupils as a fund to make her old age comfortable.

When her friends learned she intended to travel third class, if necessary, they subscribed voluntarily to the project contributing sums ranging from 50 to 500 yen.

Referring to the assassination of Premier Hara, Mme. Yajima said that it was the result of the war. “Murder is easy for many today,” she said. “It is a great tragedy. Premier Hara was the first coming from the people to hold that office.”

Asked as to the feeling of the Japanese towards America, the quaint little envoy smiled and said, “There are yellow journals in my country as well as here. They, of course, engender ill feeling among many, but the real Japan, as the real America, still has a desire for world peace.”

Questioned as to what she thought would be the outcome of the conference, Mme. Yajima said that she believed it would succeed. “It is my hope, and the hope of all sane people in the world, so why talk of failure.”

She then added that her mission was not only to do with the peace conference, but to bring a message from the Japanese women to the womanhood of America. “We must be friends,” she said—“women the world over must be friends.”

“Our women are bewildered,” she continued. “They are groping about in the darkness. They have heard of this great conference in Washington, but know little about it. They are hoping and praying that it will prove to be the means of promoting world peace. Behind their petition are vast spiritual resources. This roll of rice paper I am carrying President Harding represents the mobilization of thousands of hearts.

“I come with no official title and with no credentials. Of my own country’s delegates to the conference I can only say that they were not chosen directly by the people. We have much confidence in them, and Japan feels fortunate in having such open-minded liberal representatives.”

## AS KOREA FEELS

China was fortunate, in a sense, when the Paris Conference gave Shantung to Japan, for while the world saw in Japan’s demands gross injustice, the event had the effect of concentrating universal attention upon the wrongs that have been inflicted by one nation and then another on China in the past few decades. And today China’s case is generally recognized as one of the fundamental concerns of the Conference on Limitation of Armaments.

Korea, which also has suffered at the hands of Japan, seeks to get her case before the conference in Washington. The Korean people have employed former United States Senator Charles S. Thomas, of Colorado, to act as their counsel before the conference, and, so far as possible, the Korean view as to the facts of the relations between Korea and Japan are being laid before the American people. In the October issue of the *Korea Review* is a touching and eloquent editorial, captioned “Korea and the Conference.”

It says:

In area and population Korea is the smallest of the Far Eastern nations, but on account of her geographical position she is the key to Far Eastern problems.

Korea is a distinct and separate nation, differing in language, customs, and psychology from her neighbors, and lies between China, Japan, and Russia. Korea, the buffer State among these nations, helped to keep peace and order in that part of the world. She carried out this mission successfully for over forty centuries. But in the latter part of the last century she was obliged to open her doors to foreign intercourse principally through the persuasion of the United States. At first she was afraid to admit foreigners, but was assured by the United States and the principal powers of Europe that her safety would be guarded and protected by them. Korea felt secure with these solemn promises, which were apparently given in good faith. She opened her door wide and permitted all foreigners who wished to do so to enter, and enrolled herself as a member of the community of nations of the world. But, to her bitter sorrow, she soon found that it was to lead to her undoing. Her near neighbors soon began to undermine her; first China, then Russia, and finally Japan. However, despite all these plots and counter-plots, she felt safe because of her childlike faith in the solemn pledges of protection and guarantee given by America, Great Britain, France, Italy, and other nations.

In 1910 Korea received the final shock. Japan, her ally in the Russian war, who solemnly and definitely guaranteed her independence, became her betrayer and the assassin of her sovereignty. Her professed friends of the Western World looked on the crime with indifference, without even a word of protest. These friends have been either frightened by the perpetrator of the crime or have forgotten their treaty obligations. In either case, Korea’s cup of sorrow overflowed and the bitterness of her disappointment was beyond description. But who cares?

The world is cold and nations are selfish. Korea never knew that, treaty or no treaty, no foreign nation will help her unless it is to its own interest to do so.

Now, however, the situation in the Far East is such that it is obviously to their own interests that the United States and European powers should fulfill their pledges to Korea. They have inadvertently helped to make Japan the Germany of Asia. Her policy, ideals, and methods employed in international dealings are identical to those of Prussia prior to 1914. If Germany was a menace to civilization in 1914, Japan is even a greater menace to the peace of the world today. Of course, the ignorant, easy-going and mentally lazy people do not believe it and do not care to know it, but the facts are there and sooner or later they will have to be faced.

The reduction of armaments or even absolute disarmament by all nations will not prevent war altogether. It will, perhaps, make war less frequent. As long as there are im-